


As for petitioner's objections, Judge Numbers concluded that the court lacks jurisdiction to address petitioner's section 2241 petition because 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is not inadequate or ineffective to address his claims. See M&R 3–5. This court has reviewed the objections de novo and reached the same conclusion. Petitioner's objections [D.E. 11] restate the arguments that he made to Judge Numbers and do not show 28 U.S.C. § 2255 inadequate or ineffective to address his claims. Compare [D.E. 11] with [D.E. 9]. The objections merit no further discussion, and the court adopts the conclusions in the M&R.

In sum, petitioner's objections to the M&R [D.E. 11] are OVERRULED, and respondent's motion to dismiss the petition without prejudice [D.E. 6] is GRANTED. The court DENIES a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c); Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336–38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

SO ORDERED. This 5 day of November 2015.


JAMES C. DEVER III
Chief United States District Judge